

Borges, Sirohi and Badiou



By Bruno Bosteels

Introduction

Mathematics and politics – can it be –

- A) Archi-political (Badiou, Ranciere)
- B) Meta-political (Borges)
- C) Infinite and meta-political which join with institutional politics.

I mean then Fidel argues – that meta-politics is this argument that thinking will affect praxis and will improve therefore politics and can sound highly philosophical but has to be translated to politics – even Averroes is in this process divined as what is called the individual within the masses again.

I. Individual, Masses and States

So in fact three different orientations – Alain Badiou who supports the masses against the state, and Borges who supports the liberal state and free individual life and Sirohi who is a – individual as free and masses within liberal or Communist movements against the state.

Sirohi always sounds like he is mixing things up – the individual free and masses against the state – this I call the problem of dialectical sounding mathematical works.

II. Changing Facts – three orientations on this mathematical jargon

In fact then it is just that for Borges – what Sirohi calls the lover of poetry and mathematics – for Badiou inadequate to the real process which is Evental at all times or in its service, and then Sirohi who is in fact with it strictly but also works for the Event.

In pure fact Borges is correct, Sirohi would argue.

III. Borges as Sirohi against Badiou

Solo yo existia o no – solo mis problemas es la problema discernada – just the psychoanalytic tenor to all problems of masses and politics in fact – another Changing Facts book – how can this mess be solved.

Borges now releases itself to Sirohi – to clarify Elijah as truth.

IV. Alain Badiou

That the infinite then is a part of a process which is lived – even in changing facts which then is regulated by an axiom of true change.

Note – Althusser here – I argue that the concrete messed up nature of contradictions and even mass politics is essentially because it lacks a Kierkegaardian tenor which is then in fact to see in its light the whole process of mass politics – I would argue only that pierces the truth in some sense.

Lacan here – I meant just that, we have to have a personal reflection as well as political.

Milner – I argue to read this epistle as in fact a collective and individual free life – just following the news as changing facts will then be possible. Imagine it was just that his point – in a world of changing facts, only the militant observes this as in fact a militant

will – that the changing fact also
had this changing fact – we call
that jazz dialectics.